

24



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,750	10/06/2000	Dan Matheson	4079.02USU1	2131

27479 7590 04/19/2004

COCHRAN FREUND & YOUNG LLC
 3555 STANFORD ROAD
 SUITE 230
 FORT COLLINS, CO 80525

EXAMINER

PHAM, THOMAS K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pre

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,750

Applicant(s)

MATHESON, DAN

Examiner

Thomas K Pham

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. Claims 1-20 of U.S. Application 09/680,750 filed on 10/06/2000 are presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Statements of Statutory 35 USC

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 2, 6, 9, 13-15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The term "tool-neutral persistent form" or "tool neutral form" was not described with a specific meaning in the specification. For the purpose of examination, it has been interpreted as a database or other storage means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnick et al. U.S. Publication no. 2002/0032592 (hereinafter Krasnick) in view of Ludwig et al U.S. Patent no. 5,867,654 (hereinafter Ludwig).

Regarding claims 1 and 8

Krasnick teaches an object model for capturing online meeting-related information, comprising: a meeting plan interface for capturing administrative meeting information of a meeting in a meeting plan object (col. 3 paragraph 41, “automated method for planning a meeting ... to achieve the desired client results”) but does not teach a meeting discussion interface for capturing substantive information pertaining to the contents of discussion during said meeting in a meeting discussion object. However, Ludwig teaches a multimedia collaboration system for capturing audio, video, and text of an online meeting (col. 2 line 66 to col. 3 line 8, “desktop teleconferencing includes ... audio/video and all data interactions”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the online meeting data capturing of Ludwig with online meeting planning program of Krasnick because it would provide for reproducing data interactively shared and manipulated by the participants of the meeting.

Regarding claims 2 and 9

Krasnick and Ludwig teach each of said meeting plan object and meeting discussion object is stored in a database (page 2 paragraph 22 of Krasnick).

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 17

Art Unit: 2121

Ludwig teaches meeting discussion interface captures product design related information (col. 1 lines 36-40, “the effective of collaboration ... or political negotiations”). Krasnick teaches storing collected data in a database with multiple objects (page 2 paragraph 28-last 2 sentences, “The meeting management module 14 ... the storage functionality of the present invention”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the product design related information in a product design related object not in any other objects.

Regarding claims 5, 12 and 18

Ludwig teaches meeting discussion interface captures decision related information (col. 1 lines 36-40, “the effective of collaboration ... or political negotiations”). Krasnick teaches storing collected data in a database with multiple objects (page 2 paragraph 28-last 2 sentences, “The meeting management module 14 ... the storage functionality of the present invention”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the decision related information in a decision object not in any other objects.

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 19

Krasnick teaches meeting plan interface provides the ability to capture a meeting agenda in a meeting agenda object, a meeting in a meeting objective object, a meeting schedule in a meeting schedule object, wherein the meeting agenda object, the meeting objective object, and the meeting schedule object are stored in a database (page 2 paragraphs 21-22, “some or all of the clients’ data ... as well as the application server 14”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store the each of the meeting object separately in the database in order to retrieve each type of information independently as needed and for avoiding any confusion over mixing information.

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 20

Krasnick teaches meeting plan interface includes a meeting management module 14 that cooperates with the associates database with multiple objects to store meeting plans (page 2 paragraphs 21-22, “some or all of the clients’ data ... as well as the application server 14”) and also teaches that the database can be vary in structure, format, content, and relationship in term of data and information entities depend on the captured information (page 4 paragraph 47, “data and information entities ... not as a limitation on its scope”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store an action item in an action item object and a commitment by a meeting participant to perform said action item in a commitment object separately in a database in order to retrieve each type of information independently as needed and for avoiding any confusion over mixing information.

Regarding claim 15

Krasnick teaches an object model for capturing online meeting-related information, comprising: a meeting plan interface for capturing administrative meeting information of a meeting in a meeting plan object (col. 3 paragraph 41, “automated method for planning a meeting ... to achieve the desired client results”) and storing the different objects in a database (page 2 paragraph 22) but does not teach a meeting discussion interface for capturing substantive information pertaining to the contents of discussion during said meeting in a meeting discussion object. However, Ludwig teaches a multimedia collaboration system for capturing audio, video, and text of an online meeting (col. 2 line 66 to col. 3 line 8, “desktop teleconferencing includes ... audio/video and all data interactions”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the online meeting data

Art Unit: 2121

capturing of Ludwig with online meeting planning program of Krasnick because it would provide for reproducing data interactively shared and manipulated by the participants of the meeting.

6. Claims 3, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnick in view of Ludwig and further in view of Kadlec U.S. Patent no. 6,212,530.

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 16

Krasnick teaches each of said meeting plan object stored in a database storage repository (page2 paragraph 22) and Ludwig teaches meeting discussion object is stored in an audio/video storage database but do not teach the relational database and the relationship of the tables in the object model. However, Kadlec teaches a relational database design technique that includes entities and relationships among the entities of a database model (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the relational database of Kadlec for storing the meeting plan and meeting discussion of Krasnick and Ludwig because it would provide for relating the meeting objects with relationship keys. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill for the associations between relational objects or tables using foreign keys in order to establish a unique relationship between the objects or tables.

Art Unit: 2121

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (703) 305-7587 and fax number is (703) 746-8874, Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 7:30AM- 5:00PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. Anthony Knight* at (703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231**, or **Hand-delivered** responses should be brought to **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist located on the 4th floor)**, or fax to the **official fax number (703) 872- 9306**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Thomas Pham
Patent Examiner

TP

April 15, 2004


Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600